



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,976	07/11/2001	Nuggehally S. Jayant	07816.105004	9723

30827 7590 05/19/2005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

CATHEY II, PATRICK H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/902,976

Applicant(s)

JAYANT ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick H. Cathey II

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim's 5-8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sethuraman et al. (US 6,434,196).

As for Claim's 5, 10 and 11, Sethuraman et al. teach a video encoder operative to receive the input video stream and an input control stream and to generate an encoded video stream (Column 3, lines 10-23), a scene change detector operative to detect a scene change in the series of pictures and to classify a first picture following the scene change as a first intra-picture (I-picture) (Column 13, lines 36-53) and to classify at least one other picture following the scene change as a predicted picture (P-picture) and to classify at least one second picture as a bi-directionally predicted picture (B-picture) (Column 3, lines 18-24), and a bit allocation module operative to determine whether a first GOP uses less than a predetermined target number of bits and further operative to allocate an unneeded bit to a second GOP in response to a determination that the first GOP uses less than the predetermined target number of bits (Column 12, lines 4-22).

As for Claim's 6 and 12, Sethuraman et al. teach comprising a bit rate controller operative to compare a previous macroblock of a first picture to a subsequent macroblock in a second picture and to determine that the subsequent macroblock is different than the previous macroblock (Column 5, line 62 to column 6, line 13).

As for Claim's 7, 8 and 13, Sethuraman et al. teach where the bit rate controller is further operative to determine a first criterion characterizing the relationship between the previous macroblock and the subsequent macroblock and to compare the first criterion to a first threshold value and to instruct a decoder to represent the subsequent macroblock in an identical form as the previous macroblock, in response to a determination that the first criterion is less than the first threshold value (Column 15, lines 18-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sethuraman et al.

Many of the limitations have been addressed in the above rejections. Sethuraman et al. fail to specifically teach representing the subsequent macroblock in a non-identical form as the previous macroblock, in response to a determination that the

Art Unit: 2613

first criterion is less than the first threshold value. Since Sethuraman et al. do teach representing the macroblock in identical form (Column 15, lines 18-45), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to represent the macroblock in non-identical form especially because the image would not be in as clear of form and the data would not be as compressed when representing with a non-identical form. (Official Notice)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references not used in the above rejections were included because they teach additional information regarding the compression of video data and allocating bits.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick H. Cathey II whose telephone number is (571)272-7326. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 to 5:00 (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571)272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patrick H. Cathey II
Examiner
Art Unit 2613

PHC


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600